UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/014,108	11/13/2001	Takashi Igarashi	01730/LH	4018

1933 7590 08/10/2006

FRISHAUF, HOLTZ, GOODMAN & CHICK, PC
220 Fifth Avenue
16TH Floor
NEW YORK, NY 10001-7708

EXAMINER	
FRITZ, BRADFORD F	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2141	

DATE MAILED: 08/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/014,108	IGARASHI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Bradford F. Fritz	2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 May 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *24-50* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *24-50* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 24-50 have been presented for examination and are rejected.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed May 23rd, 2006 with respect to claims 24-50 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 24-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Beck et al (5,832,511), hereinafter referred to as Beck.

5. Regarding claim 24, Beck disclosed an apparatus administrating system comprising: an image outputting apparatus connected to a network (column 5, lines 59-65), said image outputting apparatus including a plurality of units for performing a plurality of functions (column 5, lines 59-65), and a control device having a memory to store software for controlling the plurality of units (column 5, lines 59-65); and an administrating apparatus connected via the network with the image outputting apparatus to enable information to be at least one of transmitted and received between the image

outputting apparatus and the administrating apparatus (column 5, lines 59-65), such that the administrating apparatus is enabled to conduct maintenance administration for the image outputting apparatus through the network (column 5, lines 59-65 and column 6, lines 25-36); wherein the administrating apparatus obtains working information regarding a working condition of the image outputting through the network and renews the software stored in the memory of the control device of the image outputting apparatus through the network in accordance with the obtained working information (column 22, lines 36-56) so that the plurality functions and the plurality of units of the image outputting apparatus are maintained operable in an updated state (column 6, lines 25-36 and column 37, line 60 – column 38, line 15).

6. Regarding claim 25, Beck disclosed a system wherein the image outputting apparatus comprises a checking device to check the working condition of the image outputting apparatus, and the working information includes check data of the checking device (column 22, lines 36-60).

7. Regarding claim 28, Beck disclosed a system wherein each of the plurality of functions and each of the plurality of units of the image outputting apparatus is provided with a specified mark for identification and is controlled by specific software (column 22, lines 36-60), and wherein the administrating apparatus obtains working information of each of the plurality of functions and each of the plurality of units and renews the software separately for each plurality of functions and each of the plurality of units (column 22, lines 36-60).

8. Regarding claim 29, Beck disclosed a system wherein the administrating apparatus comprises a memory device and stores the working information in the memory device (column 22, lines 36-60).

9. Regarding claim 30, Beck disclosed a system wherein the working information stored in the memory device is available from the image outputting apparatus (column 22, lines 36-60).

10. Regarding claim 31, Beck disclosed a system wherein the system comprises a plurality of said image outputting apparatuses (column 5, lines 59-65), and wherein the administrating apparatus obtains working information with respect to each of the plurality of image outputting apparatuses (column 22, lines 36-60), judges whether each of the plurality of image outputting apparatuses has any abnormality (column 22, lines 36-60), and renews the software controlling any of the image outputting apparatuses detected to be abnormal through the network (column 6, lines 25-36 and column 37, line 60 – column 38, line 15).

11. Regarding claim 32, Beck disclosed a system wherein the maintenance administration conducted by the administrating apparatus includes improvement work and remodeling work for the image outputting apparatus (column 6, lines 25-36 and column 37, line 60 – column 38, line 15).

12. Regarding claim 33, Beck disclosed an apparatus administrating system wherein the image outputting apparatus has a function to transmit structural information regarding the plurality of units (column 6, lines 25-36 and column 37, line 60 – column 38, line 15), and the administrating apparatus judges at least one of: (i) compatibility

between each of the plurality of units and the image outputting apparatus (column 22, lines 36-60), and (ii) compatibility among the plurality of units (column 22, lines 36-60).

13. Regarding claim 34, Beck disclosed a system wherein the structural information includes a serial number and a version of software controlling the image outputting apparatus (column 22, lines 36-60 and column 32, lines 33-49).

14. Regarding claim 35, Beck disclosed a system wherein the image outputting apparatus transmits the structural information to the administrating apparatus when the image outputting apparatus is connected to the network (column 1, lines 25-30 and column 22, lines 36-60).

15. Regarding claim 36, Beck disclosed a system where the image outputting apparatus transmits the structural information to the administrating apparatus in response to a request from the administrating apparatus (column 1, lines 25-30, and column 22, lines 36-60).

16. Regarding claim 37, Beck disclosed a system wherein the image outputting apparatus periodically transmits the structural information to the administrating apparatus (column 1, lines 25-30 and column 22, lines 36-60).

17. Regarding claim 38, Beck disclosed a system wherein the image outputting apparatus transmits the structural information to the administrating apparatus if the administrating apparatus needs the structural information (column 1, lines 25-30 and column 22, lines 36-60).

18. Regarding claim 39, Beck disclosed a system wherein when the administrating apparatus judges that a compatibility in a version of software between each of the

plurality of units and the image outputting apparatus is not proper, the administrating apparatus controls the image outputting apparatus to download compatible software (column 22, lines 36-60 and column 37, line 60 – column 38, line 15).

19. Regarding claim 40, Beck disclosed a system wherein when the administrating apparatus judges that the compatibility in a version of software among each of the plurality of unit is not proper (column 22, lines 36-60), the administrating apparatus notifies the image outputting apparatus (column 32, lines 33-49).

20. Regarding claim 41, Beck disclosed a system wherein the administrating apparatus notifies the image outputting apparatus of a software incompatibility (column 21, lines 36-60 and column 32, lines 33-49), selects compatible structure (column 37, line 60 – column 38, line 15), and notifies the image outputting apparatus of the compatible structure (column 37, line 60 – column 38, line 15).

22. Regarding claim 42, Beck disclosed a system wherein the image outputting apparatus has a function to transmit to the administrating apparatus structural information including at least one of specific ID information, producer-specified information (column 22, lines 36-60), and version information corresponding to software installed in the image outputting apparatus (column 22, lines 36-60), and wherein the administrating apparatus has a function to judge compatibility of the image outputting apparatus based on the structural information received from the image outputting apparatus (column 22, lines 36-60).

23. Regarding claim 43, Beck disclosed a system wherein the image outputting apparatus has a function to transmit to the administrating apparatus structural

information including at least one of specific ID information (column 22, lines 36-60), producer-specified information, and version information corresponding to each of the plurality of units and each of a plurality of software to the administrating apparatus (column 22, lines 36-60), and wherein the administrating apparatus has a function to judge compatibility among the plurality of units and the plurality of software (column 22, lines 36-60), and to automatically switch one of incompatible software and an incompatible unit of the image outputting apparatus or to change a version of the incompatible software (column 22, lines 36-60 and column 6, lines 25-36 and column 37, line 60 – column 38, line 15).

24. Regarding claim 44, Beck disclosed an apparatus administrating system wherein the administrating apparatus obtains error log information from the image outputting apparatus and judges whether a malfunction has occurred in the image outputting apparatus based on error log information (column 22, lines 36-60).

25. Regarding claim 45, Beck disclosed a system wherein the administrating apparatus at least one of changes, revises and updates software controlling the image outputting apparatus based on the error log information (column 22, lines 36-60 and column 6, lines 25-36 and column 37, line 60 – column 38, line 15).

26. Regarding claim 46, Beck disclosed a system wherein the image outputting apparatus transmits the error log information in response to a request of the administrating apparatus (column 22, lines 36-60).

27. Regarding claim 47, Beck disclosed a system wherein the image outputting apparatus transmits the error log information to a request of the administrating

apparatus when the error log information is required (column 1, lines 25-30 and column 22, lines 36-60).

28. Regarding claim 48, Beck disclosed a system wherein the image outputting apparatus transmits the error log information periodically (column 1, lines 25-30 and column 22, lines 36-60).

29. Regarding claim 49, Beck disclosed a system wherein the image outputting apparatus transmits the error log information when necessary (column 1, lines 25-30 and column 22, lines 36-60).

30. Regarding claim 50, Beck disclosed a system wherein the image outputting apparatus transmits the error log information at a timing corresponding to contents of the error log information stored in the memory (column 1, lines 25-30 and column 22, lines 36-60).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

31. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

32. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beck in view of Nakamura (U.S. Patent No. 5,970,217).

33. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beck in view of Carew et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,955,073), hereinafter referred to as Carew.

34. Regarding claim 26, Beck teaches the invention as described above. However, Beck does explicitly not teach a system wherein the check device includes sensors for heat, light and pressure in order to detect changes in values of predetermined physical characteristics. Nakamura teaches a system wherein the checking device includes sensors for heat, light and pressure in order to detect changes in values of predetermined physical characteristics (see column 1, lines 11-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the sensors for heat, pressure and light as taught by Nakamura in the system of Beck, because both Nakamura and Beck are from the same field of endeavor of image outputting apparatus systems, and by detecting errors with various sensors provides a system wherein there is an improved means for if the "recording of image data has been performed normally can be judged automatically" (see abstract).

35. Regarding claim 27, Beck teaches the invention as described above. However, Beck does explicitly not teach a system wherein the checking device includes a monitor for photographing the working condition of the image outputting apparatus, detecting odor around the image outputting apparatus, and sensing smells around the image outputting apparatus. Carew teaches a system wherein the check device includes a monitor for photographing the working condition of the image outputting apparatus, detecting odor around the image outputting apparatus, and sensing smells around the image outputting apparatus (see column 3, lines 39-51). It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the sensors for chemicals and acoustics as taught by Carew in the system of Beck, because both Carew and Beck are from the same field of endeavor of image outputting apparatus systems, and by detecting with sensors provide a system that provides for improved "automatic analysis and standard automatic data processing outputs" (see column 2, lines 3-5).

Conclusion

36. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bradford F. Fritz whose telephone number is 571-272-3860. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on 571-272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BF

BF

RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER